

RECORD

OF THE



HON. MR. CHAPLEAU'S GOVERNMENT

AND THE

HON. MR. JOLY'S PLATFORM.

The electors of this Province are now called upon to make their choice of the men who shall administer their affairs for the five years' term of the next Parliament. It therefore becomes their duty to examine carefully the issues presented in the electoral contest now taking place.

With a view of enabling those who shall read these lines to decide upon the merits of the case, an outline is here presented of the policy of each of the leaders of the Quebec Parliament.

Hon. Mr. JOLY, it will be remembered, acceded to office early in 1878, upon the dismissal by the late Lieut.-Governor, Mr. Letellier, of the DeBoucherville Government on the ground principally that the latter were in the hands of railway rings that threatened to involve the Province in serious financial embarrassment. By taking office, Mr. Joly assumed the responsibility of that dismissal, and, on appealing to the country, obtained a majority of one voice in the new Parliament, whereas he had had a following of only a handful of 15 or 16 men in the preceding.

The country's approval of Mr. Joly's Government was further shown by the four elections that took place upon

the unseating of members who had been guilty of improper practices in the general election. This, being a loss of 4 to the then Opposition and a gain of 4 to the Joly Government party, gave a working majority of 8 votes in a full House.

It will also be remembered that this majority was lost by the defection of 5 of Mr. Joly's supporters, Messrs. Chauveau, Paquet, Flynn, Racicot and Fortin. Their reasons for deserting their chief are therefore the first subject that the electors should now pronounce upon. The solid and substantial reasons of the first three are easily appreciated. Mr. CHAUVÉAU, a member of Mr. Joly's Government, was rewarded for his treachery by the permanent office of Police Magistrate at Quebec. Mr. PAQUET, who has since been shown a notoriously corrupt, as well as faithless man, had already met with a rebuff from Mr. Joly when he wanted the Liberal Government to defend the English Bondholders in the Levis & Kennebec Railway. Mr. Joly's indignant refusal lost him the favour of Mr. Paquet. We next hear of the latter, after becoming a member of Mr. Chapleau's Government, receiving the reward of more illegal services in the shape of \$14,000 sent him by the French Credit Foncier. As Mr. Joly says in his speech, in Montreal, \$14,000 was probably the price at which Canadian Ministers were quoted on the Paris Bourse or Stock Exchange.

Mr. FLYNN was also rewarded for his desertion by a portfolio in the Chapleau Government. Mr. RACICOT and Mr. FORTIN were the other two, and the former, by those who knew him best, the Conservatives of his own county, has been contemptuously rejected as their candidate, Dr. Brigham standing in his stead. The defence put forward by these deserters is worthy of notice. They admit and admire Mr. Joly's noble character; they do not dare to differ from any act of his policy. They merely deserted him because he had not a strong Government. They knew he was right; but because he was not strongly supported in the right, they turned traitor and left their chief, to join the camp of a man that they had long known to be the head and front of rings of all sorts. Surely the true way to make his Government strong was to

go to him with assurance of support, not faithlessly to leave him in the hour of necessity.

The success of the manœuvre was brought about, as all are aware, by the unconstitutional interference of the Legislative Council. THEY, not the people's representatives, not the taxpayers, but the non-representative Upper Chamber, stopped the supplies. This is easily accounted for when it is known that only two of that body were Liberals in politics, all the rest being partisan Conservatives. Mr. Joly demanded an appeal to the people, but was refused by the new Lieutenant-Governor.

By this means the Chapleau Government came into power, and we have now to examine its record.

And we would first direct attention to the financial administration of the two Governments.

When the DeBoucherville Government was overthrown they were about to impose direct taxes on the people, and Mr. Joly undertook by economy to avoid the necessity of this. The following figures will show whether he carried out his promise. He took office in March, 1878, and his first and only complete financial year began on the 1st of July, 1878, and ended 30th June, 1879. During that time he reduced the expenditure of the Government in the following items:—

Legislative Council :—

Expenses 1876.....	\$ 44,107	Reduction in 1879
" 1877.....	41,507	from 1878:
" 1878.....	49,600	
" 1879.....	36,000	
	<hr/>	\$13,600

Legislative Assembly :—

Expenses 1877.....	111,800	
" 1878	128,490	
" 1879.....	93,859	
	<hr/>	34,631

General Elections :—

1876*	30,813	
1879.....	15,130	
	<hr/>	From 1876*, \$15,683

* Year of general elections, which are also included in 1879.

Total Legislation † :—

1876*....	\$200,420	Reduction in 1879
1877.....	167,969	from 1878:
1878.....	218,587	
1879.....	153,185	
		65,452

Civil Government :—

1877.....	165,278	
1878.....	175,708	
1879.....	157,710	
		17,998

Administration of Justice, Police, Reformatories and Prison Inspection :—

1877.....	520,858	
1878.....	539,840	
1879.....	473,946	
		65,394

Public Instruction :—

1877.....	360,000	
1878.....	376,000	
1879.....	371,000	
		5,000

Agriculture, Immigration, &c. :—

1877.....	\$189,000	
1878.....	157,000	
1879.....	116,000	
		41,000

Public Works and Buildings :—

1877.....	\$205,000	
1878.....	260,000	
1879.....	190,000	
		50,000

Charities :—

1877.....	\$240,000	
1878.....	240,298	
1879.....	271,000	
		Increase nearly 31,000

† This includes the two first items above, in which also is comprised the reduction of the Speaker's salary from \$2,400 to \$2,000 immediately after the Hon. Mr. Turcotte's appointment, a fact which, combined with the high character of Hon. Mr. Joly and of Mr. Turcotte himself, is a sufficient refutation of the charge that the latter gentleman's course was followed from improper motives.

* Year of general elections, which are also included in 1879.

Crown Lands Department :— Reduction in 1879
1877..... \$169,000 from 1878 :

from 1878:

22,708

	Total Expenditure, less Railway, &c.	Interest, &c., on debt.	Controllable Expenditure.
1877.....	\$2,486,913	\$407,176	\$2,079,737
1878.....	2,681,517	482,661	2,198,856
1879.....	2,711,608	727,097	1,984,511

	Total Expenditure, less Railways, &c.	Interest, &c., on debt.	Controllable Expenditure.
1877.....	\$2,486,913	\$407,176	\$2,079,737
1878.....	2,681,517	482,661	2,198,856
1879.....	2,711,608	727,097	1,984,511

Mr. Joly's plans were also laid for large reductions in the succeeding year, but his estimates were grossly exceeded under Mr. Chapleau's administration.

Legislative Council :—

\$6,000 increase.

1879.....	\$ 93,000
1880.....	129,000

1879.....	\$ 93,000
1880.....	129,000

\$36,000

We must also give the following figures for the Railway management, that is, the management of the Q., M., O. & O. Railway :—

In 1879 paid for Salaries, Traffic Expenses, &c,	
Q. M. O. & O., Western Division.....	\$141,979
In 1880 paid for same on the whole line.....	419,805

Here is an increase of..... \$277,826

which is, it is true, for a longer line of railway than in 1879, but the increase of expenditure is out of all proportion to the increase in length of line. For it is evident that the expense of adding more miles of railway should not be so large as the expense of starting the first portion, since all the general expenses have already been incurred. This is, no doubt, due to the management of the notorious L. A. Senecal, of whom a word anon.

RAILWAY ADMINISTRATION.

We have now to direct particular attention to this Government Railway. It has cost the Province \$13,000,000 for construction. Mr. Chapleau now endeavors to make the electors believe that he can sell it for \$3,000,000, and if he gets such an offer he proposes so to sell it. Now it seems unreasonable to sell our railway for \$5,000,000 less than it cost, and he explains that we were ready to give a subsidy of that amount to a company to construct it. There is a vast difference, however, between the Province paying a company \$5,000,000, to take all the risk of construction and allowing that amount after all this risk has been overcome, and after the railway is actually built in the most expensive way. It ought to yield a larger revenue than \$400,000 a year in the future if properly run, and that is the interest at 5 per cent. on \$8,000,000. For though next year it might yield only \$300,000, especially under its present management, it is probable that in two years it could be made to pay half a million, and in ten years it should yield a revenue of \$600,000 or \$700,000. Therefore, it is very questionable if that would be a good bargain. But even if it be so, and it certainly would be more profitable than leaving it under the management of Mr. Senecal, the people should see, as Mr. Joly has pointed out, that this money is paid to the creditors of the Province, and does not pass through the hands of Mr. Senecal or Mr. Chapleau.

MR. SENECAI.

The character of the administrator of this Railway, Mr. Senecal, cannot be too well known by the electors, and we call attention to the following facts in reference to his career. In the criminal libel suit against the Hon. Mr. Laurier, just terminated in the Court of Queen's Bench, Montreal, the following facts have been proved:—

That many years ago Mr. Senecal was found guilty by a jury in Three Rivers of having stolen \$50 from his partners in an undertaking they had in common. This conviction was quashed in the Court of Appeals on the ground that stealing from one's partners was not recognized by the law, as it then stood, as a felony. In consequence of this decision the criminal law was immediately amended, and the offence of which he was then found guilty is now a crime in law, as it has always been in morals.

It was also proved that Mr. Senecal obtained, by false pretences, from the Corporation of Grantham a promissory note for \$800, which they sent him to take up a former note of that amount, but instead of taking it up he discounted the note, and the Corporation of Grantham was sued for both the old note and the new.

Further, it was proved that, while manager of the Pierreville Mill Company, Mr. Senecal frequently appropriated large sums of money belonging to the Company to his own use. Among other transactions, he consigned in his own name to a creditor of his own in the United States \$11,000 worth of lumber, which the creditor afterwards refused to pay, but held in payment of a claim he had against Mr. Senecal. Mr. Senecal also bought a horse from a man named Beaupré, and paid for it in lumber belonging to the Company, and, when sued for the lumber, Beaupré refused to pay, and proved that Senecal had given him the wood in payment of the horse. Mr. Senecal, also while President of the Company, signed a note of \$5,000, and caused one of the other officials to sign it, and then discounted it and kept the proceeds for himself.

These, with other amounts, made him indebted to the Company in the sum of \$40,000 (besides interest, which

brought the amount to \$61,000), at the time when the Company was obliged to fail.

The Hon. Mr. Laurier also offered to prove that he was guilty of having ruined Mr. Adolphe Roy by obtaining notes from him under various pretexts, and especially \$17,000 by what the Judge styled "a serious crime." But the complete proof of this was prevented by the ruling of the presiding Judge.

Such was the man that Mr. Chapleau thought fit to make the General Superintendent of the most important property of the Province, the Q., M., O. & O. Railway.

In his administration of this it was also proved that he had drawn \$6,750 whenever and however he pleased, without control or interference, and without the account showing how much he was entitled to being ever made up. Indeed, the only accounts that appear by the official public documents show that for the first 3 or 4 months he was due nothing, as the expenditure of the railway exceeded the revenue by \$27,000, while the amount he should have been paid was 2½ percent on the excess of revenue over expenditure; and for the ensuing 10 months the whole of what he could claim to be paid was \$1,700; and yet he was allowed to draw as it suited himself \$6,750. This, it must be remembered, is over and above all his expenses of travelling and management, and it is notorious that Mr. Senecal made the most lavish use of his elegant official car and of special trains. All these things the Province has had to pay.

Mr. Senecal was also proved to have paid a man, Savard, whom he had hired at \$2 a day and who was kept under contract for five days, although there was no work for him, and who never did any work, a sum of \$65; and this while Superintendent of the Railway.

The defendant offered also to prove that Mr. Senecal while Superintendent had bought the Berthier Railway for \$25,000, and immediately sold it to the Government for \$29,000, and bought the Joliette Railway for \$44,000, and also sold it to the Government for \$63,000, but this evidence was excluded, as was also evidence that while Mr. Senecal was interested in the Joliette Branch one-third of the freight between Hochelaga and Joliette

went to that branch, though the distance was only seven miles out of fifty-three.

After the above evidence, ten jurymen out of twelve were prepared to say that the Hon. Mr. Laurier was justified in describing Mr. Senecal as the LEADER OF THE CAVE OF FORTY THIEVES. This, then, is the man to whom Mr. Chapleau's Government entrusts the most important asset of the Province, and this is how he manages it. Mr. Chapleau pretends that Mr. Senecal does not handle the money of the railway. But it is Mr. Senecal that makes and directs appointments, enters into contracts, and has complete control of the Railway. And it is there that dishonesty, mismanagement, fraud and corruption can be most successful. It was not in handling money that the UNJUST STEWARD defrauded his lord, but in saying to the debtor of an hundred measures of oil, "Take thy bill, and sit down quickly and write fifty."

And now a word on the manner in which the Government itself tries to pull the wool over the eyes of the people. Mr. Drolet, the Auditor of the Government accounts, in his evidence in the case, tells how, when the Government found there was a deficit of \$27,000 in the management of the railway, an order was sent to him by the Government to transfer \$142,000 from the traffic to the capital account, but no vouchers were given; Mr. Drolet did not know why this order was given, it was not consistent with any system of book-keeping, and the only explanation he could think of was that Governments always like to make things look the best they possibly can. This cooking of accounts was to make an apparent surplus of \$115,000.

DIRECT TAXATION.

While referring to this railway, we must direct attention to the statement of the Hon. Mr. Chapleau in his speech in the Mechanics' Hall, Montreal, that no further taxation would be required *if the Government could sell this road* for \$8,000,000, from which we must infer that if he cannot sell it (and we have no reasonable cause for believing he has an offer for it), he MUST NOW IMPOSE DIRECT TAXATION on the people, in spite of his having al-

ready added to our burdens by a \$4,000,000 loan, or an annual charge for interest of about \$200,000 a year.

MR. CHAPLEAU'S RECKLESSNESS.

Another statement made in Mr. Chapleau's Montreal speech was that his idea of economy was not to pick up the straws that fall from the load, but to float loans at 98; but we think that economy really consists, not in floating loans at 98, but in reducing the public expenditure so that no loans at all will be required; and this is what Mr. Joly promises to do, and what Mr. Joly, if properly supported by the electors, is able to do. He has never had a full opportunity of showing his economical capacity, for while he was in office he was hampered by the most factious and outrageous Opposition that ever opposed any Minister. How could any Minister economize either time or money in the face of an Opposition that moved twenty-two votes of want of confidence in the one session of Parliament, while the efforts of that Opposition were seconded by a lavish application of bribes to Mr. Joly's followers, and by a flagrant violation of constitutional law on the part of the LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL?

The people of this Province are not self-governing so long as a Council appointed by the Crown is able to overthrow any Government elected by the people, by refusing to grant the supplies. If the Legislative Council is to interfere in the financial affairs of the Province it must be made a representative body, for no body that does not represent the people has a right to interfere with the disposal of the taxes of the people. As there is, however, no use in the Council which would justify the expenditure involved in making it a representative body, Mr. Joly proposes to abolish it entirely, and in this the electors are surely blind to their own interests if they do not support him. The members of the Council are appointed by the Crown, keep their seats for life and cannot be removed but by death or insolvency, and their opposition to any measure (and they are sure to oppose all the measures of a Liberal Government) is utterly insurmountable. Are they to be administrators of the affairs of a people who claim to be the administrators of their own affairs? No! The people of England struggled

for ages for the right to administer their own affairs, and having obtained it for themselves and for us, are we to surrender it to a factious cabal, who have shown themselves ready to tear the country's constitution to shreds in order to procure for themselves a perpetuity of political power!

MR. CHAPLEAU'S UNTRUTHFULNESS.

Mr. Chapleau also said in his Montreal speech that his Government had since its advent to power reduced the expense of the Legislative Council from \$50,000 to between \$35,000 and \$30,000 a year. How much he really did reduce it is shown by the figures we have already given and which we again subjoin:

Expense of the Legislative Council for the year ending 30th June:—

1876.....	\$ 44,107
1877.....	41,507
1878.....	49,600
1879.....	36 000
1880.....	42 000

from which it appears that Mr. Joly during the year he was in office (1879) reduced the expense from \$49,600 to \$36,000, while Mr. Chapleau, instead of reducing it from \$50,000 to \$30,000, as he boasts he did, actually increased it from \$36,000 to \$42,000.

MR. CHAPLEAU'S INCAPACITY.

Mr. Chapleau's incapacity and inattention to business are shown by the random way in which he deals with facts and figures. In his St. Therese speech he said (*Montreal Gazette Report*), "In the *Official Gazette* of yesterday a report was published showing that the Credit Foncier had loaned throughout the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario \$56,600,000—this, at the average reduction of two percent on the former charge for interest, showed a saving to the agriculturists of this Province of \$1,130,000 in one year." Mr. Wurtele, when afterwards interviewed by a *Star* reporter concerning this astounding statement, said that the \$56,600,000 represented, not the amount of money loaned, but the total value of the hypothecated property, and that he himself had coached the Premier on this subject before he went to St. Therese to deliver his speech. The \$1,130,000 would be the

amount saved, not to the Province of Quebec, but to the two Provinces of Quebec and Ontario. After this instance of Mr. Chapleau's financial ignorance and incapacity we need not be surprised to hear him estimating in his Montreal speech the revenue from the Crown Lands at \$700,000, while Mr. Flynn estimates it at \$540,000, the collection of which amount, by the way, costs the Province no less than \$144,000. Mr. Gladstone, in his speech at Leeds, advises his political opponents, in consequence of their financial incapacity, to abandon details and *to confine themselves cheerfully to generalities*. We recommend Mr. Chapleau to take the great English statesman's advice and, abandoning details, for which he is neither adapted by nature nor qualified by education, to *confine himself cheerfully to generalities*. Be it remembered, above all, that while Mr. Chapleau distinctly declares that his policy in the future is to be what his policy was in the past—that is, loans at 98 instead of stopping to pick up the straws that fall from the load; and the employment of men like Dansereau and Senecal in appointments in which they are not needed and for which they are not qualified—Mr. Joly comes before the people pledged to a policy of sweeping reforms.

MONTREAL COURT HOUSE.

The scandalous state of the public service in the Court House in Montreal, is known to all lawyers and many clients. Mr. Dansereau, Mr. Chapleau's partner in the notorious "Land Swap," has been appointed to an office in which he does nothing but draw his salary of \$2,400 a year; and there are many employees alike useless and incompetent. Clients are outrageously over-charged. The surplus of the fees charged by Government in law stamps over the cost of the administration, was \$86,460.50 in the Superior Court alone for the seven years ending 31st December, 1880, as Mr. Honey, the Prothonotary, testified in his deposition in a recent case. The Court House Tax had yielded, four years ago, \$190,000 more than the court house cost, and this has of course been largely increased since. Hon. Mr. Joly had already taken this in hand when he was in office, and a Commission had made a report, on which he would have taken action, but now things are worse than ever.

THE NECESSITY OF REFORM

in this Province is too evident to all acquainted with the administration of every department of the public service to require much comment at this stage. The DEPLORABLE STATE OF EDUCATION ought to rouse the indignant feelings of every lover of his country, and the public voice should be unmistakably given in favor of its improvement. A system of competitive examinations, or some effective means of PURIFYING THE CIVIL SERVICE and diminishing corrupt patronage, would undoubtedly engage the attention of a Liberal Government under Mr. Joly. And the best guarantee for his policy is the unassailable integrity and the unrivalled experience of Mr. Joly himself. Can the people of Quebec trust him? If so, let them give him their confidence, give him a House in which he CAN develop his policy, and let any thought of COALITION be treated as a disgraceful traffic with an enemy. If a coalition were formed with men who have been able to support Hon. Mr. Chapleau, all hope of improving our condition or bringing about honest and beneficial reforms is at an end. We cannot too firmly emphasize the utterances of our leader in denouncing this coalition, which in the past has always been a bridge by which false and feeble supporters have passed over to the enemies of all we regard as the good of the State.

In the foregoing pages we have in some measure stated what we understand to be the policy of the Liberal leader. We shall close with calling attention to the authoritative utterances of the Hon. Mr. JOLY himself, as contained in his speech delivered at Montreal on the 9th November last.

HON. MR. JOLY'S SPEECH AT MONTREAL.

He began by declaring that he was prepared to continue in the leadership of the Liberal party. He had made up his mind to retire, though certainly not because of the treatment of his friends, who were always kinder than he deserved, but when the bugle sounded he somehow found himself under arms. When the ship was drifting on the rocks he did not think it was a time for him to take the life-boat "and leave the poor old stranded wreck." His reason for wishing to retire was that he was an obstacle to coalition, for he considered that union in any representative assembly was

impossible. There always would, and there always should be an opposition watching the Government. As it was, he and his friends made a coalition only for so long as necessary to carry government measures that they considered good; and they would not sit on the treasury benches and be responsible for measures they considered bad. When the Province had heard these views, it could decide whether he should be the leader.

The principal reproach he had received when in power was that he governed too honestly. He was proud of that. Men said—Don't you see the treacherous means your opponents use?—but there was no use in the two parties both governing in the same way. And if he was to be the leader of the party he would request his friends to CARRY WITH THEM, IN POLITICAL LIFE, THE SAME HONOR AND HONESTY THAT CHARACTERIZED THEIR PRIVATE LIVES. (Loud applause.) He had been charged with ingratitude, too, but the gratitude of public men seemed to consist in rewarding their own friends from the public purse. If they were to remain in opposition till doomsday he would never be grateful in that way, and the right principles would work out some day. Their principles were the same as they were in March, 1878, when they went before the people and came back half of the Legislature of the people. They wanted to do honor to the fair fame of the Province of Quebec. If they could not make money, they must save money. When in power they saved \$250,000 by retrenchment. Mr. Chapleau told them that they must preserve the Legislative Council, because it was a protection to the minority of the Province of Quebec, that is, the English minority, the Protestant minority. But that was not what Mr. Chapleau had in his mind. His minority was the minority of the Conservative party while the Liberal party were in power. Then truly the Legislative Council was a protection to the minority. They played a part they had no right to, for they controlled the Province of Quebec without being answerable to it. They did not even represent a landed interest, like the House of Lords, but only themselves. Out of the twenty-three members, one man alone was on their side, and he had to represent the Ministry, move and second motions, declare them carried and move that the speaker leave the chair—and the speaker

was himself. (Laughter.) The Council should have been abolished before because it was useless—now it should be abolished because it was a nuisance. When Mr. Chapleau assumed power he said that he was going to form a Government of union and coalition, that all party stripes were going to disappear, that the lion and the lamb were going to lie down together, and there would be peace and happiness. But what had happened. A few Liberals had betrayed their party and gone over to the other side; that was the only coalition. Perhaps one reason why he should not be leader was that he would not obtain a majority by enticing men from the other side. He could not see any men in his enemy's ranks that he would be proud to see in the ranks of the Liberal party. Mr. Chapleau had declared that the Province of Quebec was in a prosperous condition. He speaks, for instance, of the \$700,000 revenue from the Crown Lands as being a regular revenue, and he tells us that this is a legitimate revenue upon which he could rely forever. If a pine tree was cut down, it took 300 years for another tree to grow in its place. Did they call that revenue? Every time a tree was cut out it was so much capital taken away. When they were in office the revenue was only some \$400,000, but Mr. Chapleau could not possibly guarantee that a crisis in the timber trade would never again return. Then Mr. Chapleau forgot to say what he did with that \$4,000,000 he borrowed from French capitalists. He said that \$1,500,000 went to pay the debts contracted by the Liberals when in power. But the Liberal Government only spent that money to carry out the North Shore Railway, begun by their predecessors. Mr. Chapleau said that \$1,500,000 was lost by their delay in finishing the railway—but Mr. DeBoucherville had been creeping along at a snail's pace westward, because he was counting the votes he would lose if he went by Bout de l'Île or by Terrebonne. In the end he lost the votes of both. But the Liberal Government set to work in earnest, and the first locomotive ran from Montreal to Quebec on the 8th of February, when railways are not usually finished. Mr. Chapleau was very proud of raising four million dollars in France. He hoped that the people of France would not judge this Province by some of those gentlemen who represented the Province in those negotiations, especially Mr. Senecal and Mr. Paquet

(cheers). The people of France were like the people of Scotland, with a keen eye to business—was it likely that the country which paid off its enormous debt to Prussia would send \$14,000 to a man who did not want it or know what it was for? And yet Mr. Chapleau said that that \$14,000 was placed to his credit at the bank, and he knew nothing about it. It was a wonder that France did not put the price of a minister at more than \$14,000, but he supposed that that was the quotation for Canadian ministers in the French market. Mr. Chapleau said that he would not sell the North Shore Railway for less than \$8,000,000, and said that \$13,000,000 was not really the cost of the road, because they had agreed before to pay \$5,000,000 for nothing! If Mr. Chapleau brought before the House a measure to sell the road at a fair price, there would be a coalition long enough to put that measure into practice, but the moment the measure was passed they would go back again to a separate course. But if he was in the House he would never allow the Government to get a cent of that money; it would go to the creditors of the Province of Quebec. He did not want Mr. Senecal to pocket this \$8,000,000 as he did the \$800 he got from the Grantham municipality. Speaking of the candidates before the electors of Montreal, Mr. Joly said that two of them were not old comrades of his, but he was sure that they would make good members. One of them, Mr. McShane (loud cheers), had fought side by side with him, and of all the members he had to do with there were none whose relations with him left a more pleasing reflection in his mind than Mr. McShane. He was one of the pioneers of a great Canadian industry, the cattle raising, and often came to him at Quebec, saying that he absolutely must go to Montreal on business. He had replied that he must on no account do so, and Mr. McShane stayed without a murmur. Whatever was said about Mr. McShane he was certainly loyal to his constituents.

Hon. Mr. Joly was received at the meeting with the utmost enthusiasm, which augurs well for the success of the Liberal candidates in Montreal, and it is hoped that the whole Province will take advantage of the present opportunity of placing the Hon. Mr. Joly with an honest and capable Government in power.

Montreal, 19th November, 1881.